Case 2:22-cv-00350-KJM-DB Document	131 F	Filed 03/26/24	Page 1 of 2
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
JEREMY PHILLIP PUCKETT,	No.	2:22-cv-0350 K	CJM DB
Plaintiff,			
V.	<u>OR</u>	<u>DER</u>	
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,			
Defendants.			
On December 8, 2023, plaintiff filed a motion to compel which is noticed for hearing			
before the undersigned on March 29, 2024, pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(1). (ECF Nos. 56 &			
96.) On March 22, 2024, the parties filed a Joint Statement re Discovery Dispute pursuant to			
Local Rule 251. (ECF No. 128.) According to plaintiff "at 7:08 p.m. the evening before [the]			
Joint Statement was due" defendants provided "amended responses, as well as a limited			
production of documents[.]" (<u>Id.</u> at 3.) Defendants assert this production "now moots this			
motion." (<u>Id.</u> at 5.) Plaintiff, however, explains that is not accurate. (<u>Id.</u> at 3.)			
	UNITED STATE FOR THE EASTERN I JEREMY PHILLIP PUCKETT, Plaintiff, v. COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., Defendants. On December 8, 2023, plaintiff filed a before the undersigned on March 29, 2024, pu 96.) On March 22, 2024, the parties filed a Jo Local Rule 251. (ECF No. 128.) According t Joint Statement was due" defendants provided production of documents[.]" (Id. at 3.) Defen	UNITED STATES DIST FOR THE EASTERN DISTRIC JEREMY PHILLIP PUCKETT, Plaintiff, v. COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., Defendants. On December 8, 2023, plaintiff filed a motion before the undersigned on March 29, 2024, pursuant to 196.) On March 22, 2024, the parties filed a Joint State Local Rule 251. (ECF No. 128.) According to plaint Joint Statement was due" defendants provided "ament production of documents[.]" (Id. at 3.) Defendants as	JEREMY PHILLIP PUCKETT, Plaintiff, v. ORDER COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al., Defendants. On December 8, 2023, plaintiff filed a motion to compel which before the undersigned on March 29, 2024, pursuant to Local Rule 30296.) On March 22, 2024, the parties filed a Joint Statement re Discove Local Rule 251. (ECF No. 128.) According to plaintiff "at 7:08 p.m. Joint Statement was due" defendants provided "amended" responses, production of documents[.]" (Id. at 3.) Defendants assert this production

Given the timing of defendants' production, the undersigned will continue the hearing of plaintiff's motion and order further meet and confer and updated briefing so that the undersigned can fully and accurately evaluate the parties' discovery dispute, if any. Moreover, it appears the fact discovery deadline in this action is currently June 7, 2024. Given the volume of unresolved

discovery disputes and the pace at which discovery has progressed the undersigned is concerned that this date may need to be extended. (ECF No. 55.) Pursuant to the assigned District Judge's Standing Scheduling Order the undersigned may extend the time provided for fact discovery. (ECF No. 33 at 8.) Accordingly, the parties will be provided one additional page each beyond the undersigned's 25-page limit for Joint Statements to address whether they seek an extension of the deadline for fact discovery. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. The March 29, 2024 hearing of plaintiff's motion to compel (ECF No. 56) is continued to May 3, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. at the United States District Court, 501 I Street, Sacramento, California, in Courtroom No. 27 before the undersigned; 2. The parties shall meet and confer in compliance with the Local Rules and the undersigned's Standard Information with respect to defendants' amended production; and 3. On or before **April 26, 2024**, the parties shall file either a withdrawal of the motion to compel or an updated Joint Statement re Discovery Disagreement¹. Dated: March 26, 2024 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE DB/orders/orders.civil/puckett0350.mtc.cont3.ord

¹ This Joint Statement may be 27 pages in length to allow each side 1 page to address the issue of

extending the fact discovery deadline.